

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Region II, Removal Action Branch

POLLUTION REPORT

I. HEADING

Date: November 16, 1990
From: D. Graham, OSC
To: R. Caspe, EPA
R. Salkie, EPA
J. Marshall, EPA
J. Frisco, EPA
G. Zachos, EPA
P. Hick, EPA
J. Trela, NJDEP
J. Lee, DOI
ERD, Washington, (E-Mail)
TAT

Subject: Waltons Farm Site, Delran Twp., New Jersey
POLREP: POLREP 1

II. BACKGROUND

SITE NO.: 5 N
DELIVERY ORDER NO.: N/A
RESPONSE AUTHORITY: CERCLA
NPL Status: non-NPL
Start Date: N/A
State Notification: State Notified
Status of Action Memorandum: Pending Division Director Approval

III. INCIDENT INFORMATION

A. Incident Category

Inactive hazardous waste dump site.

B. Situation

1. Site Description

The Walton Farm site is located in a residential/agricultural area along Creek Road in Delran Township, Burlington County, New Jersey. The site covers approximately one quarter acre of a 37 acre farm and directly abutts the Rancocas Creek and its adjacent wetlands. The nearest occupied residence is located less than one quarter mile from the area of contamination. The area of contamination is unfenced and unposted, allowing unrestricted access by the targeted population.

2. Incident Description

The Walton Farm was used for the disposal of powdered chemicals, primarily pesticides, from approximately 1945 to 1952. Dumping supposedly ceased in 1952 at which time a fire of unknown origin is known to have occurred. However, observations indicate that the area of contamination had been disturbed through the 1960s and 1970s.

The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) became aware of the site in June of 1986 through information provided by an anonymous source. In October of 1986 the NJDEP visited the site and collected samples which were found to contain excessive concentrations of pesticides and metals, and lesser concentrations of volatile and semi-volatile compounds. This information was presented to the Potentially Responsible Parties (PRPs) during the ensuing negotiations. However, a breakdown in negotiations between NJDEP and the PRPs resulted in NJDEP's submittal of the site for CERCLA removal action consideration.

C. Preliminary Assessment Results

During the October 1986 sampling event conducted by NJDEP, five soil samples were collected and analyzed for priority pollutant +40 analytical parameters. The primary contaminant detected was DDT in concentrations ranging from 170 ppm to 380,000 ppm. The NJDEP recommended action level for DDT in soil is 10 ppm. In addition to the DDT detected, arsenic was found in concentrations ranging from 42 to 160 ppm. The following additional compounds were also found in significant concentrations: DDD, DDE, parathion, alpha BHC, gamma BHC, endosulfan I, and heptachlor epoxide.

Field analyses conducted by RAB's Technical Assistance Team (TAT) in April 1990 has confirmed the presence of unspecified chlorinated compounds in excess of 50 ppm. This information is consistent with the October 1986 NJDEP data. In addition to the field analyses, samples were taken to rule out the presence of suspected dioxin compounds potentially resulting from the combustion of chlorinated compounds during the 1952 fire. No concentrations of dioxin which exceeded the recommended action levels were detected.

IV. Response Information

A. Planned Actions

Based upon the results of the preliminary assessment, RAB has determined that a CERCLA removal action is necessary to mitigate the threat to public health and the environment posed by the contaminated soil. The proposed action is to include securing the site, stabilizing contaminated soils, and conducting an investigation which will determine the nature and extent of contamination. The investigation will fully characterize site

contaminants in order to minimize the amount of material requiring disposal, thereby reducing the overall cost of remediation. The action memorandum requesting the funds to conduct this removal action is currently pending approval by the Division Director.

B. Status of Actions

1. Enforcement

NJDEP maintained the lead on all enforcement matters until January 16, 1990, at which time the site was referred to the EPA for potential removal action eligibility. Prior to EPA assuming the lead responsibility for the site, NJDEP had been negotiating an Administrative Order on Consent (ACO) with the PRPs. Although the PRPs were acting in good faith, a breakdown in negotiations occurred as a result of certain key issues in the ACO which could not be resolved.

Since assuming the lead for the site EPA has resumed negotiations with Pittsburgh Plate Glass (PPG) the principle PRP. At the present time, EPA's Office of Regional Counsel (ORC) has only identified PPG to be a PRP, stating that additional information is required prior to naming the additional PRPs involved in the NJDEP negotiations. PPG has expressed a willingness to perform the actions requested in the pending action memorandum.

C. Next Steps

It is anticipated that an ACO will be negotiated between PPG and EPA in the near future. However, should negotiations falter, the removal action as described in the pending action memorandum will be initiated.

C. Key Issues

No significant problems have been encountered to date.

V. COST INFORMATION

All costs are considered "proposed", pending approval of the action memorandum.

	Amount Budgeted	Cost To Date	Amount Remaining (%)
ERCS Contractor	\$121,000	\$ 0	\$121,000 (100%)
TAT	\$ 40,000	\$ 0	\$ 40,000 (100%)
EPA	\$ 53,000	\$ 0	\$ 53,000 (100%)
<hr/>			
TOTAL	\$214,000	\$ 0	\$214,000 (100%)

Donald R. Graham, OSC
Removal Action Branch

11/16/90